

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/058,350

Applicant(s)

SIMMS, DOMENICA A.

Examiner

Howard V Owens

Art Unit

1623

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Howard V Owens.

(3) _____.

(2) Larry Bugaisky.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 December 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner suggested that an after-final interview would only be granted to address acceptable claim language in the event that a continuation was filed (i.e. the use of consisting instead of comprising in the composition claims to overcome the prior art of DeBonville or Chomczynski); however, since prosecution on the merits has been closed, the narrowing of the claim language at this time would necessitate an additional search or further consideration and thus would not be considered at this time. The examiner also suggested that Mr. Bugaisky inform his client, George Jones, of the fact that the examiner has communicated with Mr. Bugaisky twice within the past two weeks on the status of this application, since Mr. Bugaisky's client had contacted the PTO on 12/19/01 with the belief that no oral communication between Mr. Bugaisky and the examiner had been established.